



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/054,284

11/13/2001

Markus Andreasson

66217

6316

7590

08/23/2004

NORMAN H. ZIVIN
Cooper & Dunham LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER

KASSA, YOSEF

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/054,284

Applicant(s)

ANDREASSON ET AL.

Examiner

YOSEF KASSA

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-19 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 and 20-22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dow et al (U.S. Patent 6,549,304), and further in view Fann (U.S. Patent 6,279,828).

With regard to claim 1, Dow discloses a processing device i.e., processor, for converting the information in each of said images to a coded representation (see col. 2, lines 62-67), a comparison device (which reads on the hand held scanner comprises correlation feature) for comparing the coded representation of said images (see col. 3, lines 5-8), for determining an overlap position between the images (see col. 8, lines 53-59); an assembling device comprising memory (see col. 3, lines 12-15, the hand held scanner does combine a textual discussion with an animation and comprises memory).

Dow does not explicitly call for assembling coded representation to form a composite representation. At the same field of endeavor, Fann teaches this feature (see col. 3, lines 1-23). At the time of the invention was made, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Fann's combining, i.e., assembling, number codes into Dow system. The motivation doing so is to

Art Unit: 2625

combine number codes for assigning an image having a width measured in unit for each designated base number within the chosen base number code system. .

With regard to claim 2, Dow discloses coded representation is a character code, such as ASCII (see col. 3, lines 5-8).

With regard to claim 3, Dow discloses coded representation comprises a division of the information inside borders, such as rectangles, each comprising portions of the information (see col. 3, lines 5-8).

With regard to claim 4, Dow discloses rectangles comprises words included in information (see Fig. 8c and 8d).

With regard to claim 7, Dow discloses a determining device for determining structures in each of said images, such as direction of lines (see Fig. 1A, items 43, 44, 46 and 66).

Claims 8 and 9 are similarly analyzed as claim 7.

Claims 11-19 are similarly analyzed as claims 1-9.

With regard to claim 23, Dow discloses a computer program for carrying out the method (see col. 3, lines 1-4).

2. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dow et al (U.S. Patent 6,549,304), Fann (U.S. Patent 6,279,828), and further in view of Gobeli et al (U.S. Patent 5,999,666).

With regard to claim 5, Dow discloses for processing the composite representation and converting it to character code format, such as ASCII (see col. 3, lines 5-15).

Art Unit: 2625

Dow does not explicitly call for character recognition device. At the same field of endeavor, Gobeli teaches this feature (see col. 2, lines 26-30). At the time of the invention was made, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of gobeli optical character recognition device into Dow system. The motivation doing so is to interpret the scanned image and provide an accurate ASCII representation of the scanned test.

Claim 6 is similarly analyzed as claim 5.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 10 and 20-22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Other Prior Art Cited

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent No. (6,236,993) to Fanberg et al disclose computer file comparison method.

US Patent No. (5,151,579) to Maginness disclose method of checking correlation between parts of ...

US Patent No. (5,054,104) to Yamaguchi discloses optical character reader.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YOSEF KASSA whose telephone number is (703) 306-5918. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BHAVESH MEHTA can be reached on (703) 308-5246. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 for regular communication and (703) 872-9306 for after Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number is (703) 306-5631. The group receptionist number for TC 2600 is (703) 305-4700.

PATENT EXAMINER

Yosef Kassa

08/17/04.



**BHAVESH M. MEHTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**